

JEFFERY A. WURST
RUSKIN MOSCOU FALTISCHEK, P.C.
East Tower, 15th Floor
1425 RXR Plaza
Uniondale, New York 11556-1425
(516) 663-6600

Hearing Date: July 22, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
In re:

Chapter 11

DPH HOLDINGS CORP., et al.,

Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)

Debtors.

-----X
DELPHI CORPORATION et al.,

Plaintiff,

Adv. Pro. 07-02597 (RDD)

-against-

WELLS FARGO BUSINESS AND WELLS
FARGO MINNESTOA,

Defendants.

-----X

**JOINDER OF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. (NAMED HEREIN AS WELLS FARGO
BUSINESS AND WELLS FARGO MINNESOTA) TO REPLIES (I) TO VACATE
CERTAIN PRIOR ORDERS OF THE COURT PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 60 AND
FED. R. BANKR. P. 9024; (II) TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE; (III)
TO DISMISS THE CLAIMS AGAINST CERTAIN DEFENDANTS NAMED IN THE
COMPLAINT; OR (IV) IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO REQUIRE PLAINTIFFS TO FILE A
MORE DEFINIE STATEMENT**

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (incorrectly named herein as Wells Fargo Business and Wells
Fargo Minnesota (together, "Wells Fargo" or "Defendant")), by its undersigned attorneys, hereby
joins, adopts and incorporates by reference the arguments set forth and exhibits annexed to the (i)
Reply of Wagner-Smith Company to Reorganized Debtors' Omnibus Response to Motions Seeking,
Among Other Forms of Relief, Orders to Vacate Certain Procedural Orders Previously Entered By
This Court And to Dismiss the Avoidance Actions Against the Moving Defendants, dated July 2,

2010 (Case No. 05-44481, Docket No. 20306); (ii) Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motions of Affinia, GKN, MSX and Valeo to: (A) Vacate Certain Prior Orders of the Court; (B) Dismiss the Complaint with Prejudice; (C) Dismiss the Claims Against Certain Defendants Named in the Complaint; (D) Dismiss Claims Based on Assumption of Contracts; or (E) In the Alternative, to Require Plaintiffs to File a More Definite Statement, dated July 2, 2010 (Case No. 05-44481, Docket No. 20304); (iii) Reply of HP Enterprise Services, LLC and Affiliates in Support of Their Motion for an Order Dismissing the Complaint with Prejudice and Vacating Certain Prior Orders Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024, dated July 2, 2010 (Case No. 05-44481, Docket No. 20331); (iv) Reply and Joinder in Further Support of Motion of Johnson Controls, Johnson Controls Battery Group, Johnson Control GMBH & Co. KG and Johnson Controls, Inc. to: (A) Vacate Certain Prior Orders of the Court; (B) Dismiss the Complaint with Prejudice; or (C) In the Alternative, to Dismiss the Claims Against Certain defendants Named in the Complaint and to Require Plaintiffs to File a More Definite Statement, dated July 1, 2010 (Case No. 05-44481, Docket No. 20298); and (v) any other subsequently filed Reply Brief.

The facts set forth in the above referenced Replies are substantially the same with respect to Wells Fargo so that any relief granted for the benefit of one or the other of the Complaining Preference Defendants should be granted for all and others who are similarly situated.

Dated: Uniondale, New York
July 2, 2010

RUSKIN MOSCOU FALTISCHEK, P.C.

By: /s/ Jeffrey A. Wurst
Jeffrey A. Wurst
Attorneys for Wells Fargo
East Tower, 15th Floor
1425 RXR Plaza
Uniondale, New York 11556-1425
(516) 663-6600